

February 9<sup>th</sup> 1967

Dear Howard--

Thank you for your note about syndication. I happily rely on your judgment about how to 'market' it, and am confident of fair treatment (or better) without asking any more about it. The extra \$bonus on my check is still a puzzle, but I certainly won't push having once brought it to your attention.

I will hasten to meet the requirements you indicated-- a) two timeless pieces and b) more routine arrangements for Tuesday arrival. My practise is to mail the articles out by 6 pm Monday, but I will try to get them out by noon. It is particularly convenient for me to write the articles over the weekend, and have them typed up Monday morning. If they don't arrive by a set hour on Tuesday, you or Hal could call me (station-to-station saves a \$1.50 and no one else answers this line) at 415-321-2764 and I will teletype it through. My TTY number now is 910-373-1745. <I also have a more convenient TTY on a dataphone at 415-327-4540, which is also a private number, and an IBM-2741 communications terminal on 415-328-1165. But these last two, while the most splendid, would only be useful if there were compatible equipment on your side>. (You might see why I write with some feeling, but also experience, about tying the telephone to the computer.) If you ever do get such gadgets, please let me know pronto.

a paren-  
thesis

I would ask you to be particularly gentle, if possible, with the Stanford Daily when they ask for the column: it would be a great convenience to me not to have to react personally ~~for~~ to requests for copies. If some local newspaper does pick it up, would it help to use their communications facilities to wire the texts to you?

How soon must you have the extra pieces? I have to prepare some testimony for the Harris committee for delivery the 28th of Febr., and this has to be in early So some time after that would suit better, unless it would delay your arrangements. I will be in Washington for a couple of days and will try to nail you down for that leisurely glass of beer we talked about.

On the Nobel piece, I've written to von Euler for more details, but if balance is just the problem, and since the article is rather long anyhow, the enclosed might do. It's just possible that they've started to plan the first conference, but more likely it's not ready for public announcement just yet: to which the answer might be, that's the best occasion to run the comment. (I can think of another time when the commentary itself, in its tone/ of implied criticism of the prize system, might have been a small bit of news. But perhaps Sartre's strident response to his prize would drown out any other.)

The Nobel article/ I've written to von Euler for whatever further details he can give. From a news standpoint, it occurs to me it might make more sense to couple the article with some story announcing the first conference or the like. In case there was some other context in your editor's mind, I am submitting a shortened version of the existing piece which is, perhaps, in better balance, i.e., says less about Nobel's familiar history.

Comgratulations on printing  $\text{CH}_3.\text{CH}_2\text{NH}_2.\text{CO.OH}$  in my 'dawn of life' note. I realize this will be nearly gibberish to many readers, but even they might get the idea of an ensemble of atoms making a more complex molecule. I notice that  $\text{OH}_2$  was turned around to the customary  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (which, however, obscures the homology with the other hydrides usually written  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{CH}_4$ ). No argument.

I hope the enclosed news item didn't spill over the wires, but I thought you ought to know about it, if only to avoid some possible biographical embarrassment sometime.

Looking forward to seeing you,

Joshua Lederberg